

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 8, 2007.

### I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1-36 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-36.

Claims 1-6, 10-16, 20-25, and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364 A1).

Claims 7-9, 17-19, 26-29, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Chan et al. in view of Katson (US 2004/0268301).

### II. Summary of Applicants' Response

The present Reply cancels claims 7, 10, 17, 26, and 29-36, amends claims 1, 11, and 20, and adds new claims 37-45, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-16, 18-25, 27-28, and 37-45. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### III. Response to Rejections

Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A method for code completion, comprising:

providing a representation of a first program in a first programming language;  
style="padding-left: 20px;">establishing a location in the first program;  
style="padding-left: 20px;">associating the location with a representation of the first program;  
style="padding-left: 20px;">obtaining code completion information relevant to the location in the first program based on the representation of the first program; and  
style="padding-left: 20px;">wherein the obtaining occurs at the behest of an extensible compiler framework;

wherein the extensible compiler framework can integrate and interact with compilers for different programming languages through a common interface; and  
wherein the extensible compiler framework provides code completion services to clients through a client interface.

Claim 1 defines a method for code completion wherein an extensible compiler framework integrates with compilers for different programming languages through a common interface and provides code completion services to clients through a client interface.

The prior art references Chan and Katson, while describing code completion in general, do not appear to disclose Claim 1's requirements of "wherein the extensible compiler framework can integrate and interact with compilers for different programming languages through a common interface; and wherein the extensible compiler framework provides code completion services to clients through a client interface." Neither reference appears to disclose a compiler framework that provides a common interface for compilers for different programming languages. Neither reference appears to disclose an extensible compiler framework that provides code completion services to clients through a client interface.

New Claim 39 further provides "wherein the client interface includes methods which accept arguments describing location within a source code file." None of the cited references appear to disclose Claim 39's limitation.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Chan and Katson. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn. Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-9, and 37-45 depend from Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1, dependent Claims 2-6, 8-9, and 37-45 are also patentable. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-9, and 37-45 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Independent Claims 11 and 20 and their

dependent Claims 12-16, 18-19, 21-25, and 27-28 are also patentable for the reasons above. Independent Claims 11 and 20 and their dependent Claims 12-16, 18-19, 21-25, and 27-28 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 4, 2007

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800